

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/510,550	Applicant(s) BARLEV ET AL.	
	Examiner Betsy L. Deppe	Art Unit 2637	

All Participants:

(1) Betsy L. Deppe.

(2) Guy Yonay.

Date of Interview: 17 November 2004

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:
52, 148, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, and 163

Prior art documents discussed:
None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 11:30 am



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claims 148 and 151 were vague and indefinite under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph because it was unclear what was transmitted at the highest transmission rate. Claim 163 was objected to as duplicative of claim 162. Claims 154 and 155 were objected to as being inconsistent with Figure 11. Claims 52, 150 and 153 were objected to because of minor informalities. Mr. Yonay agreed to changes by Examiner's Amendment in order to place the application in condition for allowance..

BEST AVAILABLE COPY